

ORAL ARGUMENT NOT YET SCHEDULED

No. 25-3041

---

IN THE  
**United States Court of Appeals  
for the District of Columbia Circuit**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

DAN EDWIN WILSON, also known as Daniel Edwin Wilson,

*Defendant-Appellant.*

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Columbia  
No. 1:23-cr-00427-DLF, Hon. Dabney L. Friedrich

---

**COURT-APPOINTED *AMICUS CURIAE*'S  
PARTIAL OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S MOTION  
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE  
OPENING BRIEF AND APPENDIX**

---

Mark W. Mosier  
Alexander J. Cave\*  
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
One CityCenter  
850 Tenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 2001  
202-662-6000

October 14, 2025

*\*Court-Appointed Amicus Curiae*

---

## ARGUMENT

The undersigned *Amicus* was appointed by the Court to “present arguments in support of the district court’s” opinion and order in this case. Doc. 2123693. Late last week, the Appellant in this appeal, Dan Wilson, filed a motion seeking a 14-day extension of his opening brief deadline from October 20, 2025, to November 3, 2025. *See* Doc. 2139824. The Court previously granted Mr. Wilson a 45-day extension after he sought consent from *Amicus*, which *Amicus* gave. *See* Doc. 2132214 (granting motion at Doc. 2132113). And earlier last week, the Court denied Mr. Wilson’s motion to amend the briefing schedule to move the deadline for *Amicus* to file his brief from 30 days after Mr. Wilson’s opening brief is filed to just seven. *See* Doc. 2139166 (denying motion at Doc. 2134079). *Amicus*’s brief is currently due on November 19, 2025. *See* Doc. 2132214.

The revised briefing schedule Mr. Wilson proposes in his latest motion seeks much the same relief the Court rejected last week: Although Mr. Wilson urges the Court to extend the deadline for his own opening brief by 14 days, he urges the Court to retain the current deadline for *Amicus*’s brief. *See* Doc. 2139824. Mr. Wilson thus proposes

to reduce *Amicus*'s time to file his brief from 30 days after Mr. Wilson's opening brief is filed to just 16. For the reasons *Amicus* has previously explained—including that Mr. Wilson has already agreed to consent to a 45-day extension of *Amicus*'s deadline should *Amicus* seek one, *see* Doc. 2135916—the Court should reject that request, which Mr. Wilson made without any notice to *Amicus* or any request for *Amicus*'s consent. *Amicus* takes no position on Mr. Wilson's request to extend his own briefing deadline.\*

---

\* *Amicus* originally filed this partial opposition as a letter to avoid adding to any confusion on Mr. Wilson's part regarding *Amicus*'s limited role in this proceeding. *Compare* Docs. 2134079, 2137416 (contending that *Amicus* is improperly acting as a party), *with* Doc. 2135916 (explaining that *Amicus* is merely an *amicus*). *Amicus* now refiles the substance of his earlier letter as a responsive pleading at the Court's instruction. By doing so, *Amicus* in no way suggests or concedes that he is somehow acting as a party rather than an *amicus*. *Amicus* is responding to Mr. Wilson's motion only to the extent that it directly affects *Amicus*'s interests. *Amicus* respectfully requests that the Court treat this partial opposition as a request for leave to file a response and grant such leave if the Court deems it necessary.

## CONCLUSION

This Court should deny Appellant's motion to the extent it seeks to extend Appellant's opening brief deadline without extending *Amicus's* briefing deadline by an equal amount. *Amicus* otherwise takes no position on Appellant's motion.

Dated: October 14, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Alexander J. Cave

Mark W. Mosier

Alexander J. Cave\*

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One CityCenter

850 Tenth Street, NW

Washington, DC 2001

202-662-6000

*\*Court-Appointed Amicus Curiae*

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

1. This document complies with the type-volume limit of Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2)(A) because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f) and D.C. Cir. R. 32(e)(1), this document contains 456 words.

2. This document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because this document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word for Office 365 in 14-point Century Schoolbook.

/s/ Alexander J. Cave

Alexander J. Cave

*Court-Appointed* Amicus Curiae

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on October 14, 2025, I filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system. Counsel for other parties are registered CM/ECF users and service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

/s/ Alexander J. Cave  
Alexander J. Cave

*Court-Appointed* Amicus Curiae